

SKLARWILLIAMS, PLLC  
Crane M. Pomerantz (NV Bar NO. 14103)  
410 S. Rampart Blvd., Suite 350  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
Telephone: (702) 360-6000  
Facsimile: (702) 360-0000  
[CPomerantz@sklar-law.com](mailto:CPomerantz@sklar-law.com)

OLSHAN FROME WOLOSKY LLP  
Kyle C. Bisceglie (*pro hac vice*)  
Kyle J. Kolb (*pro hac vice*)  
1325 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10019  
Telephone: (212) 451-2300  
Facsimile: (212) 451-2222  
[Kbisceglie@olshanlaw.com](mailto:Kbisceglie@olshanlaw.com)  
[Kkolb@olshanlaw.com](mailto:Kkolb@olshanlaw.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs REMARK  
HOLDINGS, INC. and KANKAN LIMITED*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

REMARK HOLDINGS, INC., et al.,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

CHINA BRANDING GROUP LIMITED (IN  
OFFICIAL LIQUIDATION), et al.,

*Defendants.*

Case No. 2:18-cv-00322

**STIPULATION FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME FOR  
PLAINTIFFS TO RESPOND TO  
CAYMAN DEFENDANTS'  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO ENFORCE THE  
STIPULATION FOR SETTLEMENT  
(FIRST REQUEST)**

Pursuant to LR IA 6-1, Remark Holdings, Inc.; Kankan Limited; China Branding Group Limited (In Official Liquidation), an exempted Cayman Islands company acting by and through its joint official liquidators ("CBG"); and the Joint Official Liquidators, with no personal liability, Hugh Dickson of Grant Thornton Specialist Services (Cayman) Ltd, and David Bennett of Grant Thornton

1 Recovery and Reorganisation Ltd (the “JOLs,” and together with CBG, the “Cayman Defendants”)  
2 hereby stipulate to the extension of Plaintiffs’ time to respond to the Cayman Defendants’ Opposition  
3 to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Enforce the Stipulation for Settlement to **April 15, 2019**. In support of this  
4 stipulation, the undersigned parties state as follows:

5 1. The Cayman Defendants filed a ten page opposition to Plaintiffs’ motion to enforce  
6 on April 1, 2019 (*see* ECF No. 67). The opposition raises various issues regarding the enforceability  
7 of the stipulation for settlement and comes at a time when Plaintiffs’ counsel was overseas for a week  
8 and is simultaneously working to amend their complaint pursuant to the Court’s Order (ECF No. 66).

9 2. The additional time is not sought for purposes of delay, but, instead, is necessary for  
10 Plaintiffs and undersigned counsel to respond adequately to the opposition to the motion to enforce.

11 3. This is the parties’ first request for an extension.  
12

13 DATED: April 4, 2019

14 /s/ Kyle J. Kolb

15 Kyle C. Bisceglie (*pro hac vice*)  
16 Kyle J. Kolb (*pro hac vice*)  
17 OLSHAN FROME WOLOSKY LLP  
18 1325 Avenue of the Americas  
19 New York, New York 10019

20 Crane M. Pomerantz (NV Bar No. 14103)  
21 SKLAR WILLIAMS, PLLC  
22 410 S. Rampart Blvd., Suite 350  
23 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145

24 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs REMARK*  
25 *HOLDINGS, INC. and KANKAN LIMITED*

/s/ Robert D. Weber

Robert D. Weber (*pro hac vice*)  
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER &  
HAMPTON LLP  
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1600  
Los Angeles, California 90067-6055

Robert J. Cassity (NV Bar No. 9779)  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
9555 Hillwood Dr., Second Floor  
Las Vegas, NV 89134

*Attorneys for China Branding Group*  
*Limited (In Official Liquidation) and its*  
*Joint Official Liquidators Hugh Dickson and*  
*David Bennett*

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 REMARK HOLDINGS, INC., et al.,

Case No. 2:18-cv-00322

4 *Plaintiffs,*

5 v.

6 CHINA BRANDING GROUP LIMITED (IN  
7 OFFICIAL LIQUIDATION), et al.,

8 *Defendants.*

**ORDER ON STIPULATION FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME FOR  
PLAINTIFFS TO RESPOND TO  
CAYMAN DEFENDANTS'  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO ENFORCE THE  
STIPULATION FOR SETTLEMENT**

9  
10  
11 The Court, having considered the above stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing,  
12 finds as follows:

13 1. The Cayman Defendants filed a ten page opposition to Plaintiffs' motion to enforce  
14 on April 1, 2019 (*see* ECF No. 67). The opposition raises several new issues to brief regarding the  
15 enforceability of the stipulation for settlement and comes at a time when the Plaintiffs are  
16 simultaneously working to amend their complaint pursuant to the Court's Order (ECF No. 66).

17 2. The additional time is not sought for purposes of delay, but, instead, is necessary for  
18 Plaintiffs and undersigned counsel to respond adequately to the opposition to the motion to enforce.

19 3. This is the parties' first request for an extension.

20 IT IS ORDERED THAT Remark Holdings, Inc. and KanKan Limited shall have until  
21 **April 15, 2019** to file their reply in support of their motion to enforce.

22  
23 IT IS SO ORDERED

24   
25  
26 United States Magistrate Judge

27 DATED: April 8, 2019  
28